

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webje.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/551,993	10/04/2005	Hiroshi Tamagaki	279148US0PCT	6455	
OBLON SPIV	7590 10/05/200 AK, MCCLELLAND	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET			MILLER, JR, JOSEPH ALBERT		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1792		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/05/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/551,993	TAMAGAKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JOSEPH MILLER JR	1792		

	JOSEPH MILLER JR	1792					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 21 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.					
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	Information of the final registration of the final registration of the final rejection, whichever is later. In however, will the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 	:						
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 		•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provide status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-17.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Timothy H Meeks/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792	/JOSEPH MILLER JR/ Examiner, Art Unit 1792						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The requirement of instant claims 1 and 11 that the film is deposited in alpha alumina crystal structure has not been presented (versus 'formation' of such a layer).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants amendment to require the deposition (versus the "formation") of a film in alpha allumina structure requires further search and consideration. Applicants argue that the present invention is carried out at a different pressure from that of the prior art, however, the pressure requirements noted are not claimed. Appliants also argue that Schaeffer and Warnes teach the deposition of the alpha alumina layer at a higher temperature and therefore the temperature range in dependent claims is not taught, but does not address the inclusion of Tair at in the rejection. Taira is included as an alterantive method of producing the alpha alumina layer and therefore the teachings of Warnes regarding temperature are not applicable. The method of Taira is combined with that of Warnes as a low-temperature method of forming an alpha alumina film.

It is further noted that it is not clear that applicants amendment of claims 1 and 11 would overcome the comibnation of Taira with Warnes in view of Schaeffer - as Tair teaches the direct deposition of an alpha alumina film.